md points to an interesting feature of the phenomenon tfhich they had failed to observe—namely, that the jump s always of the nature of a withdrawal movement: he offers the teleological explanation that the movement expresses an endeavour to avoid or terminate the pain-nducing contact. Both explanations are causal; and ;he latter will probably seem the more satisfactory and complete, for the former leads on to the further question, i/VTiy is the movement always one of withdrawal ? And :o this the most learned human physiologist can give wily a very speculative answer in terms of nerve-:onnexions, an answer which involves various question-ible assumptions about noci-ceptive sense-organs and :heir nervous connexions with the muscles.

No explanations of natural phenomena that science can ;>ffer are entirely and completely satisfying. All are based upon inductive generalizations. And inductive generalization is based on the assumption that all things are of natural kinds or classes, all members of each kind being essentially and enduringly similar to all its fellows. And universal experience goes to show that *in the main* this assumption is pretty well-founded, is itself a sound inductive generalization. We cannot explain why this is so. We simply accept it as pretty nearly true or highly probable. On it the great principle of strict determination is founded. But we must not allow ourselves to be deceived into believing that any inductive generalization is to be regarded as absolutely true.[1]

Modern science has had some warning shocks in this

respect. The atomic theory is an attempt to provide a

[1] If all elements were in constant process of spontaneous rapid transmutation (as a few are in constant spontaneous slow transmutation), empirical generalization would be very hazardous.